

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. EDCV 23-2543 JGB (DTBx)

Date March 14, 2024

Title *Korttney Elliott v. The Stout House, LLC, et al.*

Present: The Honorable JESUS G. BERNAL, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

MAYNOR GALVEZ

Not Reported

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Attorney(s) Present for Plaintiff(s):

None Present

Attorney(s) Present for Defendant(s):

None Present

Proceedings: Order to Show Cause (IN CHAMBERS)

The complaint filed in this action asserts a claim for injunctive relief arising out of an alleged violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), a claim for damages pursuant to California’s Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”), and other state law claims. (See “Complaint,” Dkt. No. 1.) The Court only has jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim and other state law claims pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1337(a).

The supplemental jurisdiction statute “reflects the understanding that, when deciding whether to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, ‘a federal court should consider and weigh in each case, and at every stage of the litigation, the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity.’” City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997) (quoting Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988)). Therefore, the Court ORDERS Plaintiff to show cause in writing why the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims on or before **March 22, 2024**. See 28 U.S.C. § 1337(c).

In responding to this Order to Show Cause (“OSC”), Plaintiff shall identify the amount of statutory damages that Plaintiff seeks to recover. Plaintiff and Plaintiff’s counsel shall also support their responses to the OSC with declarations, signed under penalty of perjury, providing all facts necessary for the Court to determine if they satisfy the definition of a “high-frequency litigant” as provided by California Civil Procedure Code Sections 425.55(b)(1)-(b)(2).

Additionally, defendants must answer the complaint within 21 days after service (60 days if the defendant is the United States). Fed R. Civ. Proc. 12(a)(1). In the present case, it appears that defendant The Stout House has not filed a timely answer. Accordingly, the Court, on its

own motion, **ORDERS** plaintiff to show cause in writing on or before **March 22, 2024**, why this action should not be dismissed as to the applicable defendants for lack of prosecution.

Plaintiff shall file a Response to this OSC no later than March 22, 2024.

Failure to timely or adequately respond to this OSC may, without further warning, result in the dismissal of the entire action without prejudice or the Court declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act and other state law claims and the dismissal of any such claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Pursuant to Rule 78 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court finds that this matter is appropriate for submission without oral argument. The Order to Show Cause will stand submitted upon the filing of a responsive pleading or motion on or before the date upon which a response by the plaintiff is due.

IT IS SO ORDERED.